

## REMARKS

### I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. In the May 19, 2005 Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,933,004 to Jackson et al. (hereinafter "Jackson").

In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of "the second current coil constructed substantially identical in shape to the first current coil". Support for this amendment is set forth in the specification, including page 13, lines 2-8; page 14, lines 11-15; and page 16, lines 18-20. With reference to claim 12, the limitation, "wherein the second radial direction is at a substantially different angular direction from the axial direction than the first radial direction" has been added to the claim. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification, including page 14, lines 2-7 and Figs. 3, 5 and 5a.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-20, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### II. Claim 1

In the May 19, 2005 Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson. As set forth in MPEP § 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F. 2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of "the second current coil

constructed substantially identical in shape to the first current coil”. As set forth in the specification, when the current coils 22 and 24 have an identical design, economies are realized in manufacturing, stocking and distribution.

The Jackson reference does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1. For example, the Jackson reference does not disclose a second current coil “constructed substantially identical in shape” to a first current coil, as set forth in claim 1. Instead, as shown in Fig. 1 of Jackson, Jackson discloses two differently shaped current coils 18a and 18b.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Jackson does not disclose all limitations of claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable and the examiner’s rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Jackson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

### III. Claim 12

In the May 19, 2005 Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson. As set forth in MPEP § 2131, “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F. 2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitation of “wherein the second radial direction is at a substantially different angular direction from the axial direction than the first radial direction”. As set forth on page 14, lines 10-14 of the patent application, one embodiment of this unique coil configuration allows both coils to be

configured as a single reversible design and properly positioned in a space-efficient manner in the meter.

The Jackson reference does not disclose all the limitations of claim 12. For example, the Jackson reference does not disclose a current coil including five sections with the first, third and fifth section oriented in an axial direction, and a second and fourth section oriented in different radial directions, “wherein the second radial direction is at a substantially different angular direction from the axial direction than the first radial direction”. As shown in FIG. 1 of Jackson, Jackson discloses a current coil including five sections. Three of these sections are oriented in an axial direction, and two of these sections are oriented in a radial direction. However, the two sections oriented in a radial direction are at substantially that same angular direction from the axial direction. Thus, Jackson does not disclose the limitation of claim 12 that states, “wherein the second radial direction is at a substantially different angular direction from the axial direction than the first radial direction”.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Jackson does not disclose all limitations of claim 12 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable and the examiner’s rejection of claim 12 as anticipated by Jackson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

#### IV. Claim 18

In the May 19, 2005 Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson. As set forth in MPEP § 2131, “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either

expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F. 2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 18 includes the limitation of “a measurement contact element, the measurement contact element including a blade contact portion and circuit board contact portion, the circuit board contact portion configured to electrically connect to a circuit board connection, the blade contact portion including a flexible member biased toward and disposed against the exposed conductive portion”. As set forth in claim 18, and as described in further detail on page 14, line 18 to page 16, line 17, the measurement contact element is a separate piece from the coil and the circuit board. As noted in claim 18, the measurement contact element includes (i) a “blade contact portion” disposed against the “exposed conductive portion” of the current coil as well as (ii) a circuit board contact portion configured to electrically connect to a circuit board connection.

The Jackson reference does not disclose all the limitations of claim 18. For example, the Jackson reference does not disclose a “measurement contact element” comprising a “blade contact portion including a flexible member biased toward and disposed against the conductive portion” of the coil. Instead, Jackson only discloses coil blades (reference numerals 22 and 24), and does not disclose a blade contact portion with a flexible member biased toward the blades. Accordingly, the Examiner’s May 19, 2005 Office action only references the coil blades of Jackson (reference numerals 22 and 24) when pointing to a “blade contact portion” of a “measurement contact element.” Should the Examiner maintain this rejection, the Examiner should specifically show where the Jackson reference discloses a “measurement contact element” comprising a “blade contact portion including a flexible member biased toward and disposed against the

conductive portion” of the coil.

As another example of a limitation not disclosed by Jackson, it is respectfully submitted that Jackson does not disclose a “measurement contact element” comprising a “circuit board contact portion configured to electrically connect to a circuit board connection.” Accordingly, the Examiner’s May 19, 2005 Office action only references the circuit board (reference numeral 34 of Jackson) when pointing to a “circuit board contact portion” of a “measurement contact element.” Should the Examiner maintain this rejection, the Examiner should specifically show where the Jackson reference discloses a “measurement contact element” comprising a “circuit board contact portion”.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Jackson does not disclose all limitations of claim 18 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is allowable and the examiner’s rejection of claim 18 as anticipated by Jackson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn

V. Dependent Claims 2-11, 13-17 and 19-20

Dependent claims 2-11, 13-17 and 19-20 depend from and incorporate all the limitations of one of allowable independent claims 1, 12, or 18. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-11, 13-17 and 19-20 are also allowable for at least the same reasons the independent claims 1, 12 and 18 are allowable.

VI. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of

this application is, therefore, respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Russ Fowler". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "R" and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Russell E. Fowler II  
Attorney Registration No. 43,615

Please address correspondence to:

Russell E. Fowler II  
Maginot Moore & Beck  
Bank One Center Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3000  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5115

Telephone: (317) 638-2922  
Facsimile: (317) 638-2139  
Email: [refowler@maginot.com](mailto:refowler@maginot.com)